CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

VOL. 1. JANUARY 1, 1830. NO. 9.

EDITED BY

AYLETT RAINS.

Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.—JUDE.

REASONS FOR WITHDRAWING FROM THE UNIVERSALISTS.

No. IV.

As the third charge which I have presented against the Universalists, is of a serious nature, and involves several questions of vast importance to mankind, it may be necessary to give it some additional attention.

I have said, that '*I perceived among the Universalists much of the leaven of infidelity and scepticism:*' and will one of their editors, or any man of respectability among them, presume to say that this is not a fact? I did not say, as the editors of the 'Star' have endeavored to make me to say, that those Universalists who are thus alarmingly leavened with infidelity, have yet wholly rejected the scriptures. No: The idea which I intended to express, is, that the Universalists are in a state of *progressive apostasy*, which will, if some preventive be not used, terminate in a rejection of the Holy Scriptures! Nor have the editors of the 'Star' been able in any degree to invalidate those testimonies by which this charge was sustained. They have, it is true, mentioned the names of a few *sectarianized priests*, who have left the ranks of orthodoxy, and avowed themselves unbelievers. But does this circumstance extenuate the sin of infidelity, as it exists among themselves? This method of argumentation is, as if one sinner should endeavor to justify himself, by saying, 'my neighbor also is a sinner!' The editors of the 'Star' ought

by this time to have known, that I have but little veneration for sectarian establishments; and that I would consequently esteem the apostasy of one sectarian, a very inefficient *salvo* for the infidelity of another! In my first reason for withdrawing from the Universalists, I proved their whole fraternity to be an unauthorized, anti-scriptural faction, associated on such principles as the great apostle to the Gentiles denominates 'carnal;' and I have also since proved the same with respect to all other sects, who are embodied around peculiarities of any description, which did not constitute the *centre of attraction* in the primitive 'church of God.' Why, then, do the editors of the 'Star' endeavor to bolster themselves in their anti-Christian aberrations from primitive Christian order, by adverting to the foibles of their sister sects?

In presenting my readers with extracts from Universalian papers, by which to sustain the above charge of infidelity and scepticism, I did not exhibit the one thousandth part of this class of evidence which might be obtained from the same source; for I was of the opinion that any candid person, after attending to the evidence which I did present, would readily conclude, that men who would in any instance, teach such doctrines as those which I quoted in my third reason, would not be sparing, on other occasions, in exhibiting similar specimens of their infidelity. Have we not cause to be seriously alarmed, when we see thousands of our fellow mortals swallowing with avidity such sentiments as the following? 'That men have a *perfect right* to doubt the existence of a God, and a future state, until they *cannot help believing!*' 'That Mr. Owen, who *cares* for no man's *God* or *creed*, manifests a *truly catholic spirit*, and that he (Mr. B.) reads his productions with *pleasure!*' 'That he should *feel* more *obliged* to the Holy Ghost, and be more *willing* to give him the *credit* of dictating the Bible, if he had used a little more *precision* in his statements!' That when Jesus commanded the people to be baptized, it was like commanding them to 'spend their lives in *puffing* with their breath against the wind;' and that he '*cares* nothing about the letter of Christ's commands!' Sentiments similar to these, may be found

in almost every number of Mr. B's paper; and yet he has the presumption to call it a '*Gospel Advocate*,' and himself '*a Christian*,' and is patronized by more than two thousand subscribers! From such Advocates, and from such Christianity, may the good Lord deliver us!

The editors of the 'Star' seem anxious to persuade the public, that Mr. B. was never popular among the Universalists as an editor, and consequently that the above sentiments have never obtained any considerable influence among them. But if this be the case, the editors of the 'Star' have need to quake, for it is a notorious fact, that the 'Star' is not a whit behind the 'Gospel Advocate' in its opposition to the Christian religion! If any person will read the tenth number of that paper, he will find one of its editors destroying, as with one Herculean blow, hundreds of the testimonies of the holy prophets who 'spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit,' by declaring that these prophets, in consequence of their *ignorance* of God, attributed to him passions which he did not possess; and as if it were not enough virtually to accuse the prophets of lying, another editor of the same paper, in a preceding number, undertakes to prove, that Peter, though preaching as 'the spirit gave him utterance,' preached *Jewish prejudices* instead of the Gospel of Jesus! Are such sentiments as *these*, any better than *those* in the Gospel Advocate, against which I have entered my protest? What! accuse the prophets of teaching falsehood, and the apostles of preaching the dark and carnal shadows of the Levitical night, instead of the Gospel, and after all this assert that you are not rejecting the Scriptures! Astonishing!

The course pursued by the editors of the 'Star,' is calculated to sap more effectually the foundation of the Christian religion, than have been all the malignant attacks of all the avowed enemies of the bible, in any age since the creation of the world. It is the *dernier resort* of infidelity! If the scriptures are ever wholly rejected, it must be by *little* and *little*. The prophets must first be believed to have been *ignorant*, and to have spoken falsely with respect to *some* particulars! This must be made to *take* with the people! Our wiseacres must then proceed *softly*, to per-

suade them that these prophets were mistaken about *one* matter after *another*, until their testimony shall be rejected in *toto*. The *virtue* of the apostles must also be at first *slightly suspicioned*, and it must be ascertained that they were not without *some* doctrinal mistakes; and as soon as the people shall manifest a willingness to *sip* at this infidel poison, our knowing ones must proceed to *increase* the dose, by detecting one mistake after another, until the people shall have lost all confidence in these inspired teachers.

I will not say that the editors of the 'Star' design to sap the foundations of the Christian religion. My opinion with respect to these editors, is, that they have been intoxicated by the bewildering impossibilities of *Calvinism*, and *Arminianism*, as I myself once was; and that as the sectarian brotherhood of the neighboring sects, are as much intoxicated as themselves, these editors, are thereby enabled to look with some degree of complacency on their own system, defective as it is, believing it to be as good as other sectarian systems; just as one homely person, in a congregation of homely persons, congratulates himself with believing that his associates are as homely as himself. The spiritual intoxication of the editors of the Star, may have so paralyzed their minds, and disordered their imaginations, as that they may not at this time be religiously *compus mentis*, and consequently may be honestly of the opinion that impeaching the prophets with lying against God, and the apostles with preaching for gospel that which is no more gospel, than Moses is the Messiah, is 'earnestly contending for the faith once delivered to the saints.' Should these gentlemen be laboring under a delirium of this kind, (and I do not think the case an improbable one,) I can assure them that if the proving of the prophets and apostles to be liars in one case, be 'earnestly contending for the faith,' it will be the same in every case; so that whenever they shall prove the scriptures of both Testaments to be a bundle of Jewish fables and prejudices, their faith will be of the highest order. But whether the editors of the Star be wise or ignorant, honest or dishonest, the tendency of their doctrine is the same, and every man who is not as drunk as was ever

a Babylonish bacchanalian, must see, that the rejection of the prophetic and apostolic testimonies, tends directly to the subverting of both Testaments; for if the apostles and prophets, when speaking professedly by inspiration, have spoken falsely in one instance, who does not see that they may have so spoken in every instance? The convicting them of falsehood in only one particular, throws a cloud of scepticism around the whole of their testimonies, just as when a man is detected in a lie, relative to a serious matter of fact, he loses his character for veracity, and is supposed to lie when he speaks the truth.

There is one thing, however, concerning which the editors of the 'Star' seem to consider the ancient prophets as very good witnesses. I mean the philanthropy of God. In reading the 'Star,' I have observed, that these editors grasp with eagerness at all those testimonies of the prophets, which they deem favorable to their system. Whenever the prophets speak of the goodness and mercy of God, as being universal, their testimony becomes in the estimation of the editors of the 'Star' infallible: but as soon as they denounce the wrath of God against the ungodly, these gentlemen beg to be excused from receiving their testimony, and squeamishly talk about their ignorance. The fact is, these editors have arrogated to themselves the right of determining with respect to the testimonies of the apostles and prophets, which of them are true, and which are false; and the criterion by which they seem to decide this question, is this: all those testimonies which either naturally, or by the labor of wresting, favor their system, are adopted, and fiddled on to the tune of Universalism from one end of the continent to the other; while those testimonies which declare the righteous wrath of heaven against incorrigible sinners, are either imputed to the ignorance of those who professed to speak them by inspiration, or carried through a *peculiar distillery*, which is always in readiness, and by which the most tremendous denunciation is, with the utmost facility, metamorphosed into a promise!

But if the prophets through ignorance declared that God was 'angry with the wicked,' who knows, whether that same ignorance might not have led them to testify

that 'God is good to all, and that his tender mercy is over all the works of his hands?' Who knows——but I am sick of such heaven daring nonsense! How insignificant must a worm of the dust appear when viewed by heavenly intelligences, who is a creature of yesterday, and is altogether dependent on the revelation which God has given, for all the knowledge which can be obtained concerning the affairs of another world, and who, notwithstanding, presumes to *pick* and *cull* those revelations, in order to support a system which originated in *self will*, and which can only be supported by *scandalizing* the Apostles and prophets?

The above charge, of infidelity and scepticism, will be sustained by additional arguments, in a review of a sermon published by Mr. Waldo, in the fifth number of the 'Star.'

EDITOR.

BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER,

A review of Mr. Waldo's sermon, on the external rites of the Church, particularly Baptism.

BAPTISM, and the Lord's Supper, are the monumental evidences of Christianity, on which is written, in divine characters, the truth of our holy religion, which the lapse of many centuries has not obliterated, and which the wit of the infidel, the sophistry of anti-christ, and the corruption of the church, have never been able to efface. These monuments were designed by the founder of the Christian religion, as significant mementos of its Divine origin, as well as of its philanthropic character, and were erected just before the kingdom of Messiah was established on earth, with the design that through all succeeding ages, and generations, they should stand in proof of those facts, on which the Christian religion is predicated. Just as the three great annual festivals under the Jewish economy, the Passover, the feast of Pentecost, and of Tabernacles, were, throughout all ages of the Jewish church, monumental evidences of the truth of the Jew's religion, and perpetuated the remembrance of those fundamental matters of fact on which their religion was based, just so does Baptism, and

the Lord's Supper, as it were, in miniature, represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus. By the feast of the Passover, the children of Israel were kept in remembrance of the preservation of their first born, when the destroying angel passed over Egypt, and smote the first born of the Egyptians;—by the feast of Pentecost, the remembrance of the giving of the law was perpetuated; and by the feast of Tabernacles, they were reminded of the period during which they dwelt in booths; and as such monuments, could no more have been erected, and palmed on the people of Israel in commemoration of the above events, except those events had happened, than could our national anniversary have been palmed on the inhabitants of the United States, had they never declared their independence, so these festivals were standing and imperishable monuments, on which every Israelite beheld written as by the finger of the Almighty, the truth of those great events, in which he was the most deeply interested. Thus do we Christians, when on the first day of the week we assemble, as did the primitive disciples, around the table of our once crucified, but now exalted Lord, behold in the *bread* and the *wine*, the *broken body*, and *shed blood* of Jesus our Saviour; and when on the margin of the *baptismal waters*, we behold a penitent believer *immersed* into, and emerging out of the *consecrated stream*, the *burial*, and *resurrection* of Jesus, with all their blissful, and soul renovating concomitants, are presented to our view!! In these *two ordinances*, the whole Gospel is proclaimed, in heaven's own language,—in God's own prophetic, demonstrative, celestial eloquence! *God* himself, by his own institutions, is the *preacher!* Yonder we behold Jesus, the meek, the lowly, the lovely Jesus, *dying* for our sins, according to the scriptures! Here we see him *buried*, and *rising* again, according to the scriptures! Yes! God is the *preacher!* No moonshine speculations,—no heathen philosophy,—no foolish dreams in such an exhibition as this! It is a *sermon* of *facts*,—a sermon of the most *interesting* and astonishing facts!—the very gospel that Paul preached at the city of Corinth? Yes! God has not only instituted baptism, and the Lord's supper, as monumental evidences

of the truth of the Christian religion, but he has so constituted them, as to proclaim by them, to earth's remotest bounds, with the utmost significancy, and purity, whenever, and wherever they shall be observed as they were by the primitive Christians, the unadulterated, and everlasting gospel; and many are the souls who have participated, through the intervention of these ordinances, in the joys of the *heavenly good news!!* The proclamation of the gospel, by the Lord's Supper, and baptism, is astonishingly impressive, and has, I have no doubt, eventuated, and will heareafter eventuate, in the conversion of thousands!!

Now these things being so, what shall we say of those men, who under pretext of propagating the gospel, lay their delacerating hands, with gothic violence on its monumental evidences, and with heaven daring presumption, trample them under their feet? Are such men the friends of Christ? Are they not rather his most dangerous enemies? Do they not as *Judas*, betray their Master with a kiss? Under pretence of love, and good will to men, and under the mask of Christianity, they accuse the prophets of *lying*, the apostles of *ignorance* and corruption, and dash to the ground with one lamentable stroke two of heaven's evidential pillars, the remembrancers of those facts upon which the whole of our religion is based. If such men are not acting the part of 'heartless Judases,' never was there a Judas in existence! What would have been thought, or said of a man, who should, during the continuance of that order of things which was introduced by Moses, have rejected the law concerning circumcision, or any of the laws under the Old Covenant? 'That soul,' says God, 'shall be cut off from among the people.' If the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzza, so that he was smitten to death because he put forth his hand and touched the Ark, when it was not lawful to do it, have not those men who treat the ordinances of the New Testament with contempt, cause to tremble? Yes! for it has been said concerning Jesus, 'that if any soul will not hear that prophet, he shall be destroyed from among the people!' and again, 'there is one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy!'

The above sentiments, are, we know, considered as being

uncharitable by our opponents, but I would here beg leave to remark, once for all, that I would not give a fig for any charity, that is broader than the New Testament. That species of forbearance, which prompts some individuals to talk of essentials, and non-essentials in the Christian religion, and to suppose that we may with impunity transgress one of the commandments of Jesus Christ, more than another, is not charity, it is sin, and folly! 'He who says he loves Jesus, and keeps not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.'

I have purposely made the above remarks, as introductory to a review, of a sermon, published by Mr. Waldo, in the fifth number of the 'Centinel and Star in the West,' on the external rites of the church, particularly baptism. I have read this sermon carefully, and have found it to be so ridiculously absurd in itself, and so contradictory to the whole genius of the Christian religion, that were it not a daring attack on the religion of Christ, and did it not obviously aim at the destruction of some of the most interesting evidences of our holy religion, I should have passed it by unnoticed. But as this sermon is of a piece with those productions for which the Star is becoming conspicuous, which productions seem calculated to destroy the Christian religion by piece meal; and as the minds of thousands, are in a state of such deplorable ignorance, as to render them an easy prey to any system of error which may chance to be compatible with their *feelings*, I will occupy a few pages, in giving this sermon a moderate castigation.

Mr. W's. text, is Rom. 14, 5: '*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind*;' his sermon is on 'the external rites of the church,' particularly 'baptism,' and he selects this scrap as a suitable motto to the discourse which succeeds it. But unfortunately, as is the case with textuaries generally, his text relates to one subject, and his discourse to another. The old adage, '*when the sky falls we shall catch larks*,' would have been just as relevant to Mr. W's. sermon, as is the context of the text which he has wrested from Paul the Apostle! The Apostle is endeavoring to settle a difficulty which existed among the members of the 'church of God,' at Rome, with respect to

holy days, and *meats* sacrificed to idols: but Mr. W. says, he is 'discussing the outward ordinances' of the church, and of course, if Mr. W. be right in the application of his text, *holy days*, and *meats* sacrificed to idols, are '*external ordinances*' of the 'church of God!' But no, such is the genius of this modern textuary, that no sooner does he touch the subject with his *magical wand*, than as by the power of *enchantment*, the *meats* and *holy days* of the Apostle, are metamorphosed into *baptism* and *the Lord's Supper*, and Paul into an Apostle of anti-Christ, laboring with all his skill, to convince his brethren, that these institutions of the King of Kings, were matters of 'absolute indifference!' Now who that has eyes, does not see, that the Apostle was not writing, in this fourteenth chapter, about any thing that had been either commanded, or prohibited by Jesus Christ; and that consequently, he was instructing his Christian brethren, that as their king had said nothing with respect to these matters, they as good subjects of the King, should not despise, nor condemn one another, in consequence of the observance, or nonobservance of such nonessentials; but that they, with respect to exery thing which had neither been enjoined, nor prohibited by the laws of their King, were bound to act under the salutary restraints of that rule which Mr. W. has selected for his text: 'Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.' To say that the Apostle meant any thing more, than this, might involve us in some serious difficulties. 'The time will come,' says Jesus, 'when every one that killeth you, will think that he doeth God service;' and consequently one of those murderers, with Mr. W's. exposition of the above text in his possession, might justify himself in the commission of murder, by saying, 'I was fully persuaded in my own mind,' that I ought to have killed my enemy!

As it is an obvious fact that Mr. W. has wrested the above text, I will here present to him, a serious question for his consideration. The apostle Peter says in his 2nd Epis. 3. 16. that in Paul's writings, 'there are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned, and unstable, wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, to

their own destruction.' Now the question is this: if the wresting of a passage of scripture, which is hard to be understood, eventuates in the destruction of those who do so, what shall be the end of those, who, to support their own darling and anti-Christian theories, wrest passages which may be easily understood? I am very sorry that friend W. made such an awkard blunder in the commencement of his boasted sermon against the 'water Baptists,' as he calls them. The very children in our *gospel schools*, will be astonished, that a teacher should be so ignorant of the most plain scriptures. But this is not all. Mr. W. has not only wrested the above text, but his whole discourse is at war with his premises: for he seems to think he has proved that the apostle was writing on the subject of church ordinances, and consequently that he was teaching his brethren not to contend about such nonessentials, and immediately turns about, and contends against them himself. This is what the apostle says, 'he would never do, while the world stands.' With respect to all nonessentials, such as meats, and holy days, and every thing else which the King has neither commanded nor prohibited, he tells them to 'have faith to themselves before God:' and in this, Paul himself, 'became all things to all men.' 'Though I be free from all men,' says he, 'yet have I made myself servant to all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law.' Mark his language! '*Being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ!*' From this you may see that this apostle never taught that *any* of the commands of Christ were *nonessentials;* nor did he ever violate any of the commands of his King, in 'becoming all things to all men.' Happy would it have been for Mr. W., had he been as consistent, as was Paul the apostle. But on the contrary, he seems to lay down rules, for the pleasure of violating them, and consequently sets down *baptism*, and the *Lord's Supper* as *nonessentials*, after he had by his transcendant skill in the legerdemain of his craft, converted *meats*, and *holy days* into

those ordinances; and then, strange as it may seem, turns upon us in a twinkling, and *growls*, a horrible *growl*, against the whole religious community, who believe in, and practice these ordinances, instead of becoming all things to the weak brotherhood, who in the simplicity of their hearts, believe that the apostles did not *lie*, when they taught these *ordinances*. O! now, friend W., this was monstrously cruel in thee! 'Through thy knowledge, (ignorance) might thy weak brother perish, for whom Christ died.' 'Now walkest thou not charitably!!'

That the Lord's Supper is an institution of the *New Testament*, and not of the *Old*, can be proved, by the most conclusive, and unequivocal testimony. 'And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave it to them, and said, take, eat: this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, this is my blood of the *New Testament* which is shed for many.' Mark 14. 22, 24. 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?' 1 Cor. 10. 16. 'Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the *ordinances* as I delivered them to you.' 1 Cor. 11. 2. 'For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks he brake it, and said, take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the *New Testament* in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come. 1 Cor. xi. 23, 26.

On the above testimonies, I will observe, 1st. That this cannot be an ordinance of the *law of Moses*, because both Jesus, and Paul declare, that 'this is the blood of the *New Testament*.'

2nd. It could not have originated in the *prejudices*, and *superstition* of the apostles, for Paul says, that '*he received*

it of the Lord;' and as he was not with the Lord, at the time when it was at *first* instituted, he must have received it by revelation, after he was called to be an apostle.

3rd. If the Lord's Supper was given to Paul by *revelation* from heaven, it must have been considered a very solemn and interesting ordinance, as will also appear to be the fact from the following testimony: 'Wherefore, whosoever shall *eat* this *bread*, or *drink* this *cup* unworthily, shall be guilty of the *body* and *blood* of the Lord. For he that *eateth*, and *drinketh* unworthily, *eateth* and *drinketh* damnation to himself, not discerning the *Lord's body*. Thus you may perceive, that there was something awfully serious in this ordinance, which some individuals would persuade us to consider, as a carnal ritual of the Law.

4th. That this *ordinance* was to be perpetuated in the church, as a standing monument of the truth of Christianity, is evident, because that Paul has said, *as often as you eat this bread, and drink this cup, you do show forth the Lord's death till he come.*

5th. Another reason why the *Lord's Supper* should be perpetuated throughout all ages of the church, is, that the *cup* is called a *cup* of blessing! '*The cup of blessing which we bless.*' Through this ordinance the saints enjoy communion with our Lord Jesus Christ, which renders the *cup* to them, a *cup* of blessing,—a blessed *cup*,—a *cup* overflowing with exquisite blessing; and therefore this ordinance should be attended to as often as practicable, by all the saints, as long as they shall desire communion with Jesus. The primitive disciples 'continued steadfastly in the *Apostle's doctrine*, and in the *contribution*, and in *breaking of bread*, and in *prayers*.'

6thly, and lastly, that the *Lord's Supper*, was not designed by the Divine founder of our religion, to have been discontinued at his coming, when Jerusalem was destroyed, as some say, is evident from this fact: it is the *breaking* of his *literal body*, and the *shedding* of his *literal blood*, which we commemorate by the *Supper*,' and therefore, this commemorative *act*, must be continued by the church, until that shall be fulfilled which was spoken by the two men in white raiment. 'This same Jesus, who is taken

up from you into heaven, shall so *come*, in like manner as ye have seen him *go* into heaven.' Acts. i. 11. As we commemorate his *literal death*, so must we continue to show forth his *death*, until he shall *come*, personally, with a shout from the heavens, with his myriads of glorious messengers!! Query. If the man 'who *eats* and *drinks* of this supper unworthily, is guilty of the *body* and *blood* of the Lord,' of what are those men guilty, who *trample* it under their feet? Do they not trample under their feet, the *body* and *blood* of the Lord?

Having now shown by positive testimony, that the *Lord's Supper* is a *gospel* ordinance, and not an ordinance of the *Old Testament*, and that it was by the appointment of our King to continue an ordinance in the church, until the period of his *personal coming*, we will proceed to show the same, with respect to the *ordinance* of *baptism*.

Mr. W. has endeavored to prove that the baptism of John was a ritual of the law, or to express it in his own refined and elegant language, 'a legal bubble;' but as if resolved to give his opponents but little trouble to shew the fallacy of this position, he has told us, in his fourth paragraph, that 'John, and his baptism, were connecting links between the two covenants or dispensations,—the law and the gospel.' Now who does not see, that if John, and his baptism, 'were connecting links between the law and the gospel,' that his baptism, was not an ordinance under the law! Mr. W. will not admit that the baptism of John was an ordinance under the gospel, because as he says, it was a 'connecting link' between the two, and yet he thinks he has proved point blank that this *connecting link*, between the law and the gospel, was an ordinance under the law! How hard it is for an errorist to be consistent! Why did not Mr. W. present us with that law of Moses which enjoins baptism? Before baptism can be proved to be a 'legal bubble,' it must be proved that it was enjoined by the law of Moses, and when this shall be proved, it will cease to be a 'connecting link between law and gospel,' and will be an ordinance under the law.

This modern sermonizer, in order to illuminate our minds with the sublime radiance of his sophistical 'Star,' and to

scatter the chilly and beggarly doctrine of water baptism to the four winds of heaven, tells us in his second paragraph, that 'John was a type of Christ, and his baptism by immersion in water, was emblematical of Christ's baptism with fire and the Holy Spirit, and that John's crying in the wilderness is a figurative expression, signifying, that he came under the dark and shadowy dispensation of the law.' Here then are three outrageous, illogical, and babyish *ipse dixits*, lugged in, as proof, infallible proof, that baptism is not an ordinance under the gospel. But has not friend W. learned that assertions are not proof? Who told you, sir, that John was 'a type of Christ,'—that his baptism was 'a type of Christ's baptism,' and that John's crying in the wilderness was a figurative expression? You might have learned these things with other nursery tales, but well assured I am, that you never learned them from the Bible! I should like to hear friend W. spiritualize Sampson's riddle, for he seems to be a profound spiritualizer! 'This crying in the wilderness is a figurative expression, signifying.' Thus we have the wilderness of Judea, in which John cried, spiritualized, or rather mystified! Why did not Mr. W. proceed to spiritualize John, and the Jordan, and the city of Jerusalem, and the land of Judea, and all the regions round about!! But no, that spiritual wilderness in which John cried, was so very pertinent to his purpose, that he could not resist the temptation to give to his readers, the spiritual meaning of the word wilderness! The wilderness in Mr. W's. vocabulary, signifies, 'dark and shadowy dispensation! Dont' forget this, gentle reader! The example which friend W. has given us in thus boldly asserting, instead of proving his positions, may in future be of immense benefit to the kingdom of the clergy, and even hair-brained enthusiasts may receive some salutary aid, in the support of their dreams, and chimeras, by adopting as a precedent, the foregoing assertions, especially that relative to the wilderness; for on this principle not only may the 'wilderness of Judea' be made to 'signify dark and shadowy dispensation,' but Jerusalem, can be proved to exist in the moon, and Judea to signify the kingdom of ultimate glory!—that is, by assertion. It seems to have

been essential to Mr. W's. anti-baptism scheme, to make John typical of Christ, and his baptism emblematical of Christ's baptism, and John's cry in the wilderness to signify his ministry under the law, and as he was utterly incapable of proving these things, it remained for him to assert them? But Mr. W. ought to have recollected, that though the time has been, when the *ipse dixits* of priests, were esteemed sacred currency, the period is now approaching when such commodities will be mingled in retrospect, with the fairy tales and witch stories of our great grand fathers!

Mr. W., in order to make it appear that John's baptism was 'an insignificant ordinance,'—a mere 'legal bubble,' has in several places substituted the word *merely*, for *verily*, and makes John say, 'I *merely* baptize you with water.' But this is just of a piece with his three assertions, and his spiritual wilderness. What nonsense would this substitute make of a great part of the New Testament, were it read in the place of verily, in every place in which this word occurs, We should make Jesus say, '*merely*, *merely*, I say unto thee, except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.' '*Merely*, *merely*, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.' '*Merely*, *merely*, I say unto you, ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled.' What nonsense is this! We know that the word *verily* signifies *truely*, *assuredly*, but who ever heard before, that *merely* was its meaning? Pitiful, and contemptible must be that cause, which cannot be vindicated, without such miserable, and heaven-daring perversions of the word of God.

Mr. W. also labors to make it appear that it was in consequence of a deep sense which John entertained of 'the futility and insignificance of his ordinance,' that he at first refused to baptize Jesus. But has he proved this fact? No. You must take his word for every thing! He has written a whole paragraph of bombast, purporting to have been spoken by John, and Jesus, by which John's baptism is made out to be a mere 'glimmering of the Levitical

night:' I say that the third paragraph of this sermon is a paragraph of bombast, and that Mr. W. has represented Jesus, and John, as speaking it, and consequently has been guilty of the crying sin of putting lies into the mouths of the most illustrious characters of antiquity; and I pledge myself to prove this charge, by proving in a proper place, that John's baptism was not an 'insignificant ordinance,' but an ordinance of the gospel. I admit that John, in the first instance, refused to baptize Jesus. But wherefore? Was it because of the 'insignificance of his baptism,' or from a sense of his own unworthiness? If it can be proved that his baptism was a gospel ordinance, it will follow of necessity that it was a sense of his own unworthiness, and of the exalted dignity of Jesus, which prompted him to say, 'I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?' Let us suppose, if you please, that John viewed his baptism as being one of heaven's most interesting ordinances, and as being designed to continue an ordinance forever, still he knew himself to be a man,—a mere man! What then must have been the emotions of his pious soul, when he beheld as a candidate for baptism, the immaculate Son of God! 'the latchets of whose shoes he was not *worthy* to unloose!' The King of Kings, the Lord of Lords, he whom 'all the angels of God worship,' desires to be immersed, and John is to be the administrator! 'I have need to be baptized of thee,' says John;—'I am not *worthy*,—I am not *worthy* to unloose the latchets of thy shoes?' Here we have proof, positive proof, that it was a sense of his own *unworthiness*, and not a sense of the puerility and insignificance of his baptism,' that caused him to say, 'I have need to be baptized of thee.' And thus we have broken another parcel of Mr. W's. cobwebs! Have patience, gentle reader, for we shall give the whole of them to the winds in a very short time.

Mr. W. seems very certain that he has proved in his fifth paragraph, that John was not a gospel preacher. But let us see how he proves this fact. These are his words: 'But to furnish a decisive answer to the present enquiry, whether John's baptism was a gospel ordinance, or a ritual of the law? We have *only* to determine whether John *was*, or

was not, a preacher of the gospel: and to solve this question, it only remains for us to ascertain how, or what he preached. This was the manner of his preaching: 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is *at hand*,'—not has arrived—but is near by, even at the doors. The phrase 'kingdom of heaven' without one exception, signifies the gospel dispensation. How then could John be a preacher of the kingdom of heaven, or, as a more correct rendering of the original would have it, the reign of peace, and his baptism an ordinance of *that* gospel, when *both* preceded its coming.' Thus far, Mr. Waldo.

From this quotation we learn that if we can *only* prove that John was a preacher of the gospel, Mr. W. will admit that his baptism was a gospel ordinance. To ascertain 'whether his baptism, was a gospel ordinance or a ritual of the law, we have *only* to determine,' says he, 'whether John was, or was not, a preacher of the gospel.' So good, so good. Well then we shall prove that John was a preacher of the gospel, and of course when we shall have done this, our point will be gained. We must however not forget that Mr. W. thinks he has proved in this same quotation, that John was not a preacher of the gospel. But what is his proof? Why, 'John preached, saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' and as 'the kingdom of heaven signifies the gospel dispensation, he could not have been a preacher of that dispensation, previous to its arrival.' Here then we have some more of Mr. W's. assertions. Now suppose I prove that the gospel was preached, previously to the coming of the kingdom of heaven, will I not have destroyed Mr. W's. hypothesis? Let us then see whether this fact can be proved. In the first chapter of Mark's testimony we are informed, that 'after John was cast into prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand, repent ye, and believe the gospel.' Now let Mr. Waldo tell how Christ could preach the gospel, before the coming of the kingdom of heaven, and we shall see how John preached the very same gospel? 'How then,' says he, 'could John be a preacher of the kingdom of heaven, (by which he says the gospel is meant,) and his baptism an ordinance of that gospel, when both preceded its coming,'

In the fourth chapter of Matthew, we are informed, that Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom. Mr. W. denies that the gospel could be preached previously to the coming of the kingdom of God, and even teaches us, that the kingdom of heaven is the gospel dispensation itself: Why then is it called the *gospel*, or *good news* of the kingdom? It is not called the kingdom, but 'the gospel of the kingdom,' that is, good news concerning the approaching reign of Messiah. Did Jesus say 'repent and believe the gospel,' before the gospel was preached?

Now since we have seen that the gospel was preached by Jesus previously to the coming of the kingdom of heaven, the very thing which Mr. W. in the plenitude of his wisdom denies, permit me in the next place, to prove positively, that John was a preacher of the gospel. Mark commences his testimony in the following words: 'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God; as it is written in the prophets, behold I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee; the voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.' John was the forerunner (not the type) of Jesus,—came to give him an introduction to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and to prepare for him a people; in order to do which, he commenced preaching the very same gospel which we have seen above that Jesus preached, when he said 'the kingdom of heaven is at hand, repent ye, and believe the gospel.' Both Jesus and John exercised themselves in identically the same ministry of the word, and were of course both preachers of the gospel. Both proclaimed the coming reign of favor, and this proclamation when made by Jesus, is expressly denominated the gospel; so that you see we have as unequivocally proved John a preacher of the gospel, as any man can prove that John existed; and if so, then Mr. W. admits that baptism was an ordinance of the gospel, and not a ritual of the law.

I know of no item in the gospel, which was not preached by John the baptist. I will not say that he exhibited the

gospel as large as life, but I will say, and prove, that he presented the whole gospel in miniature:—he presented the whole seed of mustard, which after its powers were developed, became a great tree! He preached faith, repentance, baptism for the remission of sins, the remission of sins, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life, and these constituted the primitive gospel. I say then, that John the baptist preached the whole gospel; but mark it well, I do not say, that he fully developed any one item which he did preach, for I know that the reverse of this is true. Nor was it proper that the principles of this gospel should have been instantaneously developed. The glory of its refulgence would have been too great for the feeble eyes of those to whom it was at first promulged. When John said 'behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world,' he spoke volumes! I do not say that he fully understood the vast import of this transporting declaration! Nor was it necessary that he should. How much he understood of the gospel, is not the present question, but what did he preach? this is the question. Now we know that the resurrection of the dead and eternal life are inseparably connected with the death and resurrection of Jesus; and consequently that Jesus could not have been the 'Lamb of God to take away the sin of the world,' in any other way, than by being 'delivered for our offences, and rising again for our justification.' It shall also be remembered that John preached, that 'every valley should be filled, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see the salvation of God.' Is not this gospel? The Universalists formerly considered this text to be the very cream and marrow of the gospel, as may be abundantly proved from nearly every book which they have written in vindication of their system, and it is to be presumed that they are still of the same opinion, and if so, then we have abundantly proved that John was a preacher of the gospel, and it remains that Mr. W. must either acknowledge that baptism was not an ordinance of the law, or else eat his own words.

This controversy might here terminate, were it not necessary to expose the whole of the manifest sophistry and infidelity of this sermon, and to remove difficulties from the minds of honest enquirers after truth. Mr. W's. mind seems to be full of objections to John's baptism, and he is anxious to prove it to have been of but temporary duration, and this he endeavors to do from John's words, when he says, 'he must increase but I must decrease.' In answer to this objection, I have only to say, that John did not affirm, that either his doctrine, or baptism would decrease, 'I' says he, 'must decrease.' John was the forerunner of Jesus, and by preaching the gospel, 'turned the hearts of many to the wisdom of the just;' and after having fulfilled the duties of his precursorial office, he left the stage on which he had acted with such dignity, giving place to, and acknowledging his Divine exemplar. Mr. W. however, is as dexterous in turning the personal pronoun I, in the present case, into water baptism, as he was a while ago, in converting meats and holy days, into baptism, and the Lord's Supper! The use made of the phrase 'I must decrease,' by Mr. W. would answer as an admirable vindication of infidelity, could he prove that he has made a correct use of it; for it might be applied to faith, and repentance, as well as baptism. For instance, Mr. W. argues that as John said 'I must decrease,' that therefore his baptism must decrease. Why not then argue the extinction of faith, repentance, and the remission of sins, in the same way. If John meant, that any item in the gospel which he preached would decrease, who knows whether that item, were not repentance instead of baptism; or it might have been faith, and consequently, faith and repentance, may be 'legal bubbles' as well as baptism! I admit with Mr. W. that if 'Christ had been known to the house of Israel, and an introduction had been unnecessary, John would never have come baptizing with water;' and more than this, he would never have come preaching repentance:—he would never have come in any way! and further, had not men been sinners, Jesus would never have died for our sins; and had Mr. W. understood this subject, he would never have written upon it as he has done. But Christ was not known to

Israel, and therefore did his precursor come into the world baptizing with water, and saying repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand; which as we have already shown, are the precise words which Jesus used when he preached the gospel in Galilee; and this 'gospel of the kingdom,' was not only preached by Jesus and John, but also by the twelve, and the seventy in anticipation of the reign of Messiah, and is to this day the same that it was then, with only a few exceptions; which exceptions are the following: its evidences have been increased, its principles have been more perfectly developed; and it now contemplates the Saviour as having been crucified and glorified, and his kingdom as having been established on the earth, whereas those who believed the gospel previously to the death of Jesus, contemplated all these events prospectively. But still the faith, the repentance, the baptism, the Holy Spirit, with the exception of some miraculous gifts, and the hope of eternal life, are the same in quality, though perhaps not in degree; and consequently the gospel preached by Jesus in Galilee, and by John on the margin of the Jordan, must have been in quality, and in fact the same, before as after Pentecost, though in a different state of development; for before, as after, it terminated in Jesus, the 'Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world!'

If the baptism of John was only a 'legal bubble,' it is to me surpassing strange, that Jesus should have sent his apostles out under their first commission, as Mr. W. says he did, 'to preach and immerse in water;' and if John's baptism 'was of the earth, earthy,' as Mr. W. says it was, it is equally strange to me, that Jesus should have affirmed that those who rejected John's baptism, rejected the counsel of God against themselves. 'And all the people that heard him,' said Jesus, 'and the publicans, justified God, being baptised with the baptism of John, but the pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of John' Luke vii: 29, 30. Thus you see, that Mr. W. stands in the ranks with those 'pharisees, and lawyers, who rejected the counsel of God against themselves,' and you may also learn from the above testimony, that John's baptism was from above,—not 'of the

earth, earthy,'—that it stood in, and was established by, the counsel of the Almighty.

Mr. W. is however very far from admitting that the first commission of the Apostles, 'is any thing in proof of the validity of water baptism, but on the contrary as they 'quarrelled' by the way, he infers that they were 'totally ignorant of the nature of their Master's kingdom, were under the law, influenced by carnal earthly motives, and unacquainted with any divine influence, or authority from above.' But permit me here to ask, what has the ignorance and stupidity of these apostles to do with the subject. Mr. W. acknowledges that Jesus sent them to 'preach, and immerse in water,' and if they were ignorant, and stupid, and acted wickedly by the way, I cannot see why either the gospel which they preached, or their baptism should be blamed for it! Suppose them if you please as stupid as Hottentots, and as wicked as Satan, and would it afford a rational pretext for any man to reject any item of their preaching? The apostles under their first commission preached repentance, as well as baptism, and if so, might I not argue from their ignorance and carnality, against the doctrine of repentance, with as much consistency, as Mr. W. has done against baptism? But if any person desires to see all this flowery bombast exposed, let him read Mat. x. chap. In this chapter, he will find that so authoritative was the doctrine of these men, with all their stupidity and worldly mindedness, that Jesus says to them, 'whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house, or city, shake the dust off your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, and Gomorrah, in the day of judgment, than for that city.' This you will observe is attaching great importance to the whole of the ministry of these fishermen! 'It is not ye that speak,' says Jesus, 'but the spirit of my Father, which speaketh in you.' What a contrast there is between the views of Jesus, and Mr. W. with respect to these apostles! Mr. W. says 'they were unacquainted with any divine influence, or authority from above.' But Jesus says 'it is not ye that speak!' And again, Jesus says to them, 'and as ye go, preach, saying the kingdom of heaven is at hand.'

Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give!' These, friendly reader, are the men who possessed 'no divine influence —no authority from on high.' Mr. W. tells you so, and of course you must believe him. Yes! though the Eternal Father spake to the Jews through the medium of these men, according to the testimony of Jesus, 'their ministry and baptism were of the earth, earthy;' and though they raised the dead, and cast out devils, and did many wonderful works, they were 'destitute of divine influence!!' We shewed above, that Mr. W. is in the ranks of the pharisees with respect to John's baptism, and I think that we shall here find him not far from the same place with respect to the miracles wrought by the apostles. The pharisees accused Christ of casting out devils, by Beelzebub the prince of devils, and Mr. W. denies that his apostles were the subjects of any 'divine influence,' and of course that influence by which they raised the dead, and cast out devils, must have been diabolic, for we know that human power is not adequate to such performances!

Mr. W. says that 'the command to baptize with water, was positively and unequivocally abolished, repealed, or abrogated by the recommission which Christ gave his apostles after his resurrection.' But has he proved this assertion? No, he has not. In the commission which Christ gave to his apostles after his resurrection, is there one word said about repealing 'the command to baptize with water?' Not one word! And yet Mr. W. would have the law of baptism repealed, unequivocally repealed, although there was not one word said about such repeal! Eagle sighted, and Lynx eyed critic! Now the fact is, that so far was Jesus from abrogating the law of baptism, by this second commission, that he confirmed it! 'All authority,' said he, 'is given unto me in heaven and earth, go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c.' This is the commission, gentle reader, by which Mr. W. tells us, the law concerning baptism was repealed! 'Strange infatuation!! Ah! but this baptism is the baptism of Holy Spirit and fire! Sure enough! Let us then have the

[CONCLUDED IN OUR NEXT.]